amendment says, when we say "no person shall be discriminated against by law", we have said it all. And the amendment is simply superfluous. It is repetitious and should be defeated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mitchell.

DELEGATE MITCHELL: Delegate Scanlan, two minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Scanlan.

DELEGATE SCANLAN: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, in arising to support this amendment I suppose some would say that I am being inconsistent.

Certainly it can be argued that the language, the equal protection clause, furnishes all the protection that the language proposed by the minority suggests. I think there are two answers to that.

I think we should write a Constitution for the ages and for the decades to come. There are moments when we should take into account the facts of history.

The equal protection clause has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to prohibit the type of discrimination that the minority would specifically prohibit. Those are